

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-17, 20-26, and 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,393,337 to *Panerai et al.* (“*Paneraï*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,484 to *Iwanaga et al.* (“*Iwanaga*”).

Claims 18, 19, 27, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Panerai et al.* and *Iwanaga et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,637,637 to *Atchison et al.*

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant amends independent claims 1, 17, 26, and 35. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification. See, e.g., page 6, line 27 through page 7, line 4. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-35 are pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-17m 20-26, and 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,393,337 to *Panerai et al.* (“*Paneraï*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,484 to *Iwanaga et al.* (“*Iwanaga*”). Claims 18, 19, 27, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Panerai et al.* and *Iwanaga et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,637,637 to *Atchinson et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Panerai* nor *Iwanaga*, nor *Atchinson* whether taken alone or combined, renders obvious any of claims 1-35 because neither of these references, whether taken alone or combined, teaches every feature recited in the claims. In particular,

neither *Panerai* nor *Iwanaga* teaches at least the features of manufacturing “a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate that includes a tab portion and a step portion, [and] . . . flexing the single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate of the light source and removably placing the light source in a curved three dimensional configuration within a lighting fixture by inserting the tab portion of the substrate into the lighting fixture, guided by the step portion to insure proper orientation,” as recited in newly amended independent claim 1. Amended independent claims 17, 26, and 35 recite similar language.

Panerai discloses a flexible organic light emitting diode layer mounted on a flexible substrate 37. See at least Fig. 15 and col. 1, line 29 through col. 2, line 9; col. 3, lines 28-32; and col. 6, line 51 through col. 7, line 12 of *Panerai*. Likewise, *Iwanaga* discloses an organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flexible organic light emitting diode layer on a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate. However, neither *Panerai* nor *Iwanaga* teaches “a single, flat, flexible, two-dimensional substrate that includes a tab portion and a step portion,” as recited in newly amended independent claims 1, 17, 26, and 35. Moreover, *Atchinson* fails to remedy the differences of *Panerai* and *Iwanaga*.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of newly amended independent claims 1, 17, 26, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Applicant also respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-16, 18-25, and 27-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn because these claims depend from newly amended independent claims 1, 17, 26, or 35 and, therefore, incorporate all the features of newly amended claims 1, 17, 26, or 35.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, entry of the amendments, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application, including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: February 10, 2011

By: /David E. Connor/
David E. Connor
Registration No. 59,868

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000
Facsimile: 202-739-3001